

REMARKS

Claims 14-16, 18, and 26 were pending in the application. Claims 1-13, 17, and 19-25 were previously withdrawn from further consideration. Claims 27 and 28 have been newly added. Hence, claims 14-16, 18, and 26-28 are now pending in the application.

New claim 27 recites that the bobbin includes first and second flanges and the armature-mounting structure includes grooves formed in opposing edges of the first and second flanges. New claim 28 recites that the armature is a planar armature and that each opposing edge lies in a plane that is substantially perpendicular to a plane of the armature. These claims have been added in order to more fully capture the scope of the invention. Support for the new claims may be found throughout the application in general and at least in FIG. 4 and the text associated therewith.

Claims 15-16 and 18 were amended to correct a typographical error in the dependency of the claims.

No new matter has been added.

Rejection of the Claims

Claims 14-16, 18, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6757403 (Urushibata).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Arguments in Support of the Claims

Applicant kindly thanks the Examiner for the detailed Advisory Action dated October 25, 2006. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner maintains that Urushibata discloses an armature centering function and offers FIGS. 5-9 as evidence of this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

While it is certainly possible that the armature in Urushibata is centered either horizontally or vertically between the magnet retainers, Urushibata is absolutely silent on this point. In order to anticipate the claims based on this lack of disclosure, the Examiner must show that Urushibata is susceptible to only **one possible interpretation**, namely, that the armature is somehow automatically and consistently forced to be centered within the magnet retainer. In other words, a person of ordinary skill in the art reading Urushibata must not be able to come to any conclusion besides the one advanced by the Examiner. If the person of ordinary skill in the art can arrive at just one different conclusion, then Urushibata's silence cannot be used to anticipate the claimed invention.

In the present case, Applicant respectfully submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art can easily come to a different conclusion besides the one advanced by the Examiner. For example, there may be numerous applications where it is desirable for the armature to be off-centered. Nowhere is it disclosed or suggested that the structures of Urushibata are somehow inapplicable or foreclosed to these applications.

As for FIGS. 5-9 of Urushibata, unless the Examiner knows for a fact that they are drawn to scale, and that the distance from the armature to the magnet retainer has been carefully measured, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner cannot say with any certainty whether the armature is actually centered, horizontally or vertically.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejection against independent claims 14 and 26 is respectfully requested.

With respect to dependent claim 15, Applicant noted in the previous response that Urushibata did not disclose or suggest an armature-mounting structure being formed in the **flanges**. However, this distinction was not addressed in the Advisory Action for some reason. Applicant therefore raises the distinction again for the Examiner's consideration. As Applicant tried to explain, the bobbin of Urushibata does not even have flanges as that term is understood by those having ordinary skill in the art. On the contrary, the ends of the bobbin in Urushibata appear to resemble bands more than flanges.

Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejection against dependent claim 15 is also respectfully requested.

Indeed, withdrawal of the rejection against all the dependent claims 15-16 and 18 is respectfully requested because, in addition to reciting independently allowable subject matter, these claims depend from independent claim 14 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 14.

Nevertheless, in an effort to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicant submits herewith new claims 27 and 28 directed to a receiver in which:

- the bobbin includes first and second flanges and the armature-mounting structure includes grooves formed in opposing edges of the first and second flanges (claim 27); and
- the armature is a planar armature and each opposing edge lies in a plane that is substantially perpendicular to a plane of the armature (claim 28).

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Urushibata nor any other art of record, taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the limitations of new claims 27 and 28.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant submits the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issuance.

Dated: November 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By /Daniel G. Nguyen/

Daniel G. Nguyen

Registration No.: 42,933

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

225 W. Washington, Ste. 2600

Chicago, Illinois 60606-3418

(713) 951-3300

Attorneys For Applicant